

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 20, 21, and 23 through 26 are pending, with Claims 20, 25, and 26 being independent. Claims 20, 25, and 26 have been amended. With respect to support for the amendment, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to, e.g., S214 and S215 in Fig. 2.

Claims 20, 21, 23, 25, and 26 yet again were variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent Nos. 5,706,210 (Kumano, et al.), 5,485,246 (Hayashi, et al.), and U.S. Patent No. 5,644,405 (Sato). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 20, 25, and 26 variously recite, *inter alia*, that in response to the command not being a command requesting a status of the data communication apparatus, the information, which is related to a status of the data communication apparatus, is added to a response corresponding to the command, to prompt the host computer to issue an additional command for discriminating the status, in a case where the status of the data communication apparatus, as monitored, has been changed, but not in a case where the status of the data communication apparatus, as monitored, has not been changed, and that in response to the command being a command requesting a status of the data communication apparatus, the information is not added to the response.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that none of Kumano, et al., Hayashi, et al., and Sato, even in the proposed combinations, assuming, *arguendo*, that the documents could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 20, 25, and 26.

With respect to Kumano, et al., Applicants respectfully submit that said document shows, e.g., use of a polling command, collection of abridged status information, comparing

of the content of the response with the status information, and when there is a difference, sending a command for acquiring updated information (e.g., cols. 4-5). And the Official Action states at page 3 that Kumano, et al. Fig. 3B items 31-34 “are abridged information, which is much smaller than the status data and is only added in the first response to the poll command, and not added in the updated information/status response”. Such reliance upon Kumano, et al. is respectfully traversed by Applicants. Applicants respectfully submit that information 31 to 34 is added to the response *regardless* of a result as to whether an apparatus status has been changed or not; this is revealed from the paragraph of column 4, line 60 to column 5, line 10 in Kumano, et al.; that is, upon receiving the response to which the information 31 to 34 is added, the monitoring device 3 (the polling unit 20) compares the content of the response with the status information already stored in the monitoring device 3 (the storage unit 22); when there is a difference between these two, the monitoring device 3 determines that the apparatus status has been changed; in Kumano, et al., in order to determine whether or not the apparatus status has been changed, such complicated procedures as above-mentioned are required. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Kumano, et al. is wholly silent as to at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 20, 25, and 26.

Applicants also respectfully submit that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at such features. Applicants respectfully submit that by means of such features, for example, in the present invention, if a result of monitoring by a monitoring unit indicates that an apparatus status has been changed, apparatus status change information is added to a response to a command (which is not an apparatus status requesting command), while if the result indicates that the apparatus status has not been changed, the apparatus status

change information is not added to the response; thereby, when the apparatus status has been changed, it can be securely informed to the host computer, while when not changed, the host computer can avoid executing a wasteful process.

It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at such features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Attorney for Applicants
Daniel S. Glueck
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSG/mcm

FCHS_WS 1602542v1